

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

Allowability of Claims Over Lehtiniemi & Lin

Rejection Summary

5 Claims 10, 14-18, 21, 22 & 24-26 stand rejected under 35 USC
103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,299 (Lehtiniemi) in
view of U. S. Patent No. 6,626,216 (Lin). Official Action, 20 January 2004, para.
2.

10 The Examiner concedes that Lehtiniemi "... fails to teach of a
control circuit having a user variable output that coupled [sic] to and that
makes change appearance of the variable input responsive variable appearance
portion", though the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious

15 ... to have the control circuit, as taught by Lin, in the device of
Lehtiniemi so that the color or shade of the electrochromic
medium can be progressively changed by a user between a clear
and a maximum desired color or shade (col. 8, lines 65-67).

20 The Examiner's discussion of previously cancelled Claims 11-13
and 23 is moot.

Discussion of Allowability of Independent Claim 10

25 Regarding Claim 10, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest an
electronic device, comprising

... a housing disposed about at least a portion of the
electrical hardware,

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

at least a portion of the housing comprising a variable input
responsive variable appearance portion,

5 a control circuit having a user variable output coupled to
the variable input responsive variable appearance portion of the
housing,

whereby the variable input responsive variable appearance
portion of the housing changes appearance in response to the user
variable output of the control circuit.

10 Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, there is no suggestion in the
prior art to combine the electrochromic control circuit of Lin with the device of
Lehtiniemi. Lehtiniemi discloses a cell phone housing including a
thermochromic material that changes color with changing internal or ambient
temperature. Lin discloses security system for electrochromic windows. One
15 of ordinary skill in the art would not look to window and/or window security
arts to resolve problems related to electronics housings, and thus knowledge of
window and window security arts should not be imputed to those of ordinary
skill in the electronics housing arts. There is also no suggestion to combine the
electrochromic windows of Lin with the electronics housings disclosed by
20 Lehtiniemi. Moreover, it is question whether such a combination would be
operable. In Lehtiniemi, the temperature that affects the thermochromic
material is beyond the control of the user, since the user cannot control the
environmental temperature or the internal cell phone temperature. Thus there
is no reason for to control temperature in Lehtiniemi. Claim 10 and the claims
25 that depend therefrom are thus patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi and
Lin.

Discussion of Allowability of Independent Claim 21

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

Regarding Claim 21, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest a method in a wireless communications handset having an outer housing with a variable input responsive variable appearance property portion, comprising:

5 ... providing a user variable input to the wireless communication handset;

 varying the appearance of the electro-chromic material portion of the housing in response to the user variable input applied to the wireless communication handset.

10 Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, there is no suggestion in the prior art to combine the electrochromic control circuit of Lin with the device of Lehtiniemi. Lehtiniemi discloses a cell phone housing including a thermochromic material that changes color with changing internal or ambient
15 temperature. Lin discloses security system for electrochromic windows. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to window and/or window security arts to resolve problems related to electronics housings, and thus knowledge of window and window security arts should not be imputed to those of ordinary skill in the electronics housing arts. There is also no suggestion to combine the
20 electrochromic windows of Lin with the electronics housings disclosed by Lehtiniemi. Moreover, it is question whether such a combination would be operable. In Lehtiniemi, the temperature that affects the thermochromic material is beyond the control of the user, since the user cannot control the environmental temperature or the internal cell phone temperature. Thus there
25 is no reason for to control temperature in Lehtiniemi. Claim 21 and the claims that depend therefrom are thus patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi and Lin.

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

Allowability of Claims Over Lehtiniemi, Lin & Bown

Rejection Summary

5 Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being
unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,299 (Lehtiniemi) in view of U. S.
Patent No. 6,626,216 (Lin) and US 2002/0075135 (Bown). Official Action, 20
January 2004, para. 3.

10 The Examiner relies upon Bown for teaching a light emitting
polymer material.

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 14

15 Regarding Claim 14, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Stein
fails to disclose or suggest, in combination with the limitations of Claim 10 and
any intervening claims,

20 ... the variable input responsive variable appearance portion of
the housing is a light emitting polymer material.

25 Lehtiniemi discloses a thermochromic material in a cell phone
housing and Lin discloses thermochromic windowpanes. Bown discloses the
use of a light-emitting polymer or pigment on a vibro-acoustic device.
However, there is no suggestion in Bown for varying the appearance of the
light-emitting polymer material by user input. Claim 14 is thus further
patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi, Lin and Bown.

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

Allowability of Claims Over Lehtiniemi, Lin, Bown & Bailey

Rejection Summary

5 Claims 15-16, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,299 (Lehtiniemi) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,626,216 (Lin), US 2002/0075135 (Bown) and U.S. 5,849,046 (Bailey). Official Action, 20 January 2004, para. 2 (second occurrence).

10 The Examiner relies upon Bailey for teaching an electrochromic material and control circuit, which is not disclosed by the several other primary and secondary references.

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 15

15 Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest, in combination with the limitations of Claim 10 and any intervening claims,

20 ... the variable input responsive variable appearance portion of the housing is an electro-chromic material, the control circuit having a variable voltage output coupled across the electro-chromic material.

25 Bailey discloses an electrochromic material used to indicate the charge on a battery. There is no suggestion to use the thermochromic voltage detector in Bailey as a variable appearance housing portion as in Claim 15. Also, the voltage detector of Bailey does not have a user variable output, since

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

it merely detects whatever charge remains on the battery. Claim 15 is thus further patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi, Lin, Bown and Bailey.

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 16

5

Regarding Claim 16, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest, in combination with the limitations of Claim 15, that "... the electro-chromic material is an electro-chromic polymer." Claim 16 is thus further patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi, Lin, Bown and Bailey.

10

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 22

15

Regarding Claim 22, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest in combination with the limitations of Claim 21,

... providing the user variable input by selecting a voltage applied by an electrical control circuit having a variable voltage output coupled to an electro-chromic portion of the housing.

20

The other prior art references fail to disclose a control circuit for providing a user variable input. The variable voltage output on the battery of Bailey is not an electrical control circuit. Claim 22 is thus further patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi, Bown and Bailey.

25

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 24

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

Regarding Claim 24, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest in combination with the limitations of Claim 21 and any intervening claims "... varying the variable appearance property by changing a color of the electrochromic portion of the housing in response to a variable voltage applied thereto." Claim 24 is thus further patentably distinguished over Lehtiniemi, Lin, Bown and Bailey.

**Allowability of Claims Over Lehtiniemi,
Lin, Bown, Bailey & IDS Web Article**

Rejection Summary

Claims 17-18 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,299 (Lehtiniemi) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,626,216 (Lin), US 2002/0075135 (Bown), U.S. 5,849,046 (Bailey) and the IDS Web Article. Official Action, 20 January 2004, para. 3 (second occurrence).

The Examiner relies upon the IDS Web Article for teaching an "... anodically coloring polymer and a cathodically coloring layer separated by a solid-state get electrolyte layer", which is not disclosed by the several other primary and secondary references.

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 17

Regarding Claim 17, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest, in combination with the limitations of Claim 10 and any intervening claims,

MARTINEZ

"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

5 ... the electro-chromic material includes an anodically coloring
polymer layer and a cathodically coloring layer separated by a
solid-state gel electrolyte layer, the anodically and cathodically
coloring layers disposed between first and second transparent
conducting layers.

10 The mere existence of the subject material does not render it obvious to use the
material in other applications. Moreover, the Examiner has not cited any
reason or rationale supporting the putative combination/modification. The
dubious rejection is overshadowed by suggestions of hindsight reconstruction,
a practice admonished repeatedly by the Board of Patent Appeals and
Interferences. Claim 17 is further patentably distinguished over the prior art.

15 Discussion of Allowability of Claim 18

 Regarding Claim 18, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Stein
fails to disclose or suggest, in combination with the limitations of Claim 10 and
any intervening claims,

20 ... the electro-chromic material includes first and second
transparent insulating layers, the first and second transparent
conducting layers disposed between the first and second
insulating layers.

25 The mere existence of the subject material does not render it obvious to use the
material in other applications. Moreover, the Examiner has not cited any
reason or rationale supporting the putative combination/modification. The
dubious rejection is overshadowed by suggestions of hindsight reconstruction,

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673

a practice admonished repeatedly by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Claim 18 is thus further patentably distinguished over the art.

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 25

5

Regarding Claim 25, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest, in combination with the limitations of Claim 10 and any intervening claims,

10

... the electro-chromic material includes an anodically coloring polymer layer and a cathodically coloring layer separated by a solid-state gel electrolyte layer, the anodically and cathodically coloring layers disposed between first and second transparent conducting layers.

15

The mere existence of the subject material does not render it obvious to use the material in other applications. Moreover, the Examiner has not cited any reason or rationale supporting the putative combination/modification. The dubious rejection is overshadowed by suggestions of hindsight reconstruction, a practice admonished repeatedly by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Claim 25 is thus further patentably distinguished over the art.

20

Discussion of Allowability of Claim 26

25

Regarding Claim 26, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest in combination with the limitations of Claim 17

... the control circuit having a first output coupled to the first transparent conducting layer, the control circuit having a second

MARTINEZ
"Cellular Communications Handsets Having Variable
Appearance Housings And Methods Therefor"
Atty. Docket No. CS10862

Appl. No. 10/084,965
Confirm. No. 2203
Examiner R. Osorio
Art Unit 2673


output coupled to the second transparent conducting layer by a
variable resistance element.

5 The mere existence of the subject material does not render it obvious to use the
material in other applications. Moreover, the Examiner has not cited any
reason or rationale supporting the putative combination/modification. The
dubious rejection is overshadowed by suggestions of hindsight reconstruction,
a practice admonished repeatedly by the Board of Patent Appeals and
Interferences. Claim 26 is thus further patentably distinguished over the art.

10 Prayer For Relief

In view of any amendments and the discussion above, the Claims
of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any
15 rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States
Patent without further delay.

20 Respectfully submitted,



ROLAND K. BOWLER II 15 APR. 2004
REG. NO. 33,477

25 MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, AN475
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-3978
FACSIMILE NO. (847) 523-2350